

and reduce and injuriously affect its quality and strength, and had been substituted in part for crushed oats, brewers' grains, oat feed, salt, and molasses, which the article purported to be.

Misbranding of the article was alleged for the reason that the statement, to wit, "Guaranteed Analysis \* \* \* Fibre 12.00% \* \* \* Ingredients—Crushed Oats, Brewers Grain, Oat Feed, Salt, Molasses," borne on the tags attached to the sacks containing the article, regarding it and the ingredients and substances contained therein, was false and misleading in that it represented that the article contained not more than 12 per cent of fiber and consisted of crushed oats, brewers' grains, oat feed, salt, and molasses, and for the further reason that it was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that it contained not more than 12 per cent of fiber and consisted of crushed oats, brewers' grains, oat feed, salt, and molasses, whereas it contained a greater amount of fiber, to wit, 17.02 per cent, and consisted in part of peanut hulls and alfalfa.

Analysis of a sample of the Sweet Meadow Dairy Molasses feed showed the presence 21.97 per cent of crude fiber.

Misbranding of this article was alleged for the reason that the statement "Guaranteed Analysis Fibre 15.00%," borne on the tags attached to the sacks containing the article, regarding it and the ingredients and substances contained therein, was false and misleading in that it represented that the article contained not more than 15 per cent of fiber, and for the further reason that it was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that it contained not more than 15 per cent of fiber, whereas it contained a greater amount of fiber, to wit, 21.97 per cent.

On June 15, 1920, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$30.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

**8025. Misbranding of Mumford's Navy Blood and Rheumatic Remedy. U. S. \* \* \* v. Edward A. Hecker and John W. McCarthy (Mumford's Navy Medicine Co.). Plea of guilty. Fine, \$5 and costs. (F. & D. No. 9499. I. S. No. 8137-p.)**

On April 25, 1919, the United States attorney for the Western District of Missouri, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against Edward A. Hecker and John W. McCarthy, copartners, trading as Mumford's Navy Medicine Co., Kansas City, Mo., alleging shipment by said defendants, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, on or about November 21, 1917, from the State of Missouri into the State of Oklahoma, of a quantity of a product, labeled "Mumford's Navy Blood and Rheumatic Remedy, Mumford's Navy Medicine Co., Kansas City, Mo.," which was misbranded.

Analysis of a sample of the product by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it consisted essentially of a solution containing small amounts of potassium iodid and plant extractives in alcohol and water.

It was alleged in substance in the information that the article was misbranded for the reason that certain statements, designs, and devices, regarding the curative and therapeutic effects thereof, falsely and fraudulently represented it to be effective as a remedy, treatment, and cure for the scrofulous, syphilitic, and rheumatic, as a blood purifier, and as a remedy, treatment, and cure for rheumatism in all forms, scrofulous ulcers, white swelling, abscesses, rickets, eczema, catarrh, falling of the hair, itching humors, ring worm, tetter, scald head, boils, carbuncles, pimples, erysipelas, tumors, enlarged glands, various skin diseases, scrofula, bad blood, kidney troubles, syphilis, and syphi-

litic troubles, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not. It was alleged in substance that the article was misbranded for the further reason that certain statements, designs, and devices regarding the therapeutic and curative effects thereof, appearing in the circular accompanying the article, falsely and fraudulently represented it to be effective as a remedy, treatment, and cure for blood poison, kidney trouble, and every kind of rheumatism, to eliminate from the kidneys and bladder poisonous and irritating matter as uric acid and gravel, and as a remedy, treatment, and cure for smarting and burning in the urine, and irritation in the bladder, when, in truth and in fact, it was not.

On December 23, 1919, a plea of guilty to the information was entered by the defendants, and the court imposed a fine of \$5 and costs.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

**8026. Misbranding of Sa-Van-Eg and Sa-Van-. U. S. \* \* \* v. National Clock & Mfg. Co., a Corporation. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$25 and costs. (F. & D. No. 9855. I. S. Nos. 4878-p, 4879-p.)**

On September 23, 1919, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Illinois, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against the National Clock & Mfg. Co., a corporation, Chicago, Ill., alleging shipment by said company, under the name of the Nacma Co., in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on or about May 4, 1918, and May 22, 1918, from the State of Illinois into the State of Georgia, of quantities of articles, labeled, respectively, "Sa-Van-Eg" and "Sa-Van-," which were misbranded.

Analysis of samples by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that each article consisted essentially of a cereal product, baking powder, and a small amount of skimmed-milk powder. The Sa-Van-Eg was also artificially colored.

Misbranding of Sa-Van-Eg was alleged in substance in the information for the reason that the statements, to wit, "Sa-Van-Eg," "May be used in place of 3 dozen eggs in cooking and baking only," "One level teaspoonful of Sa-Van-Eg may be used for each egg called for in recipe," "A Delicious and Wholesome Cereal and Milk Product to be Used in Place of Eggs," and "Saves about  $\frac{1}{3}$  the shortening," borne on the packages containing the article, regarding it and the ingredients and substances contained therein, were false and misleading in that they represented that said article was an egg substitute, that is to say, that by the use of said article eggs could be saved, that said article could be used in place of eggs, that the contents of each of said packages could be used in place of 3 dozen eggs, that 1 level teaspoonful of the article could be used for each egg called for in recipe, and that by using the article about  $\frac{1}{3}$  of the usual shortening could be saved; and for the further reason that it was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that said article was an egg substitute, that is to say, that by the use of said article eggs could be saved, that said article would take the place of eggs, that the contents of each of said packages could be used in place of 3 dozen eggs, that 1 level teaspoonful of said article could be used for each egg called for in recipe, and that by using the article about  $\frac{1}{3}$  of the usual shortening could be saved, whereas, in truth and in fact, said article was not an egg substitute, that is to say, by the use of said article eggs could not be saved, said article would not take the place of eggs, the contents of each of said packages could not be used in place of 3 dozen eggs, 1 level teaspoonful of said article could not be used for each egg in recipe, and by using the article  $\frac{1}{3}$  of the usual shortening could not be saved, in that it was a mixture composed essentially